

**DAVIE DISTRICT BOUNDARIES
REVIEW COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 6, 2006**

1. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 6:34 p.m. Present were Chair John Stevens, Vice-Chair Don Burgess, Julie Aitken, Sidney Calloway, Jason Curtis, Ken Jennings, Scott McLaughlin, Scott Spages and Jim Thomas. Also present were Acting Assistant Town Administrator Russell Muniz, Assistant Town Clerk Barbara McDaniel, GeoWeb representatives Scott Burton and Karen Volarich, and Secretary Lorraine Robinson recording the meeting.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: September 26, 2006, October 10, 2006 and October 23, 2006.

Mr. Spages made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Burgess, to approve the minutes. In a voice vote, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 9-0)**

3. DISCUSSION ITEMS

3.1 District Boundary Review

Chair Stevens asked the consultants for an update on the status of the selection process. Ms. Volarich described the maps presented to the Boardmembers. She advised that the objective of the meeting was to review the maps and narrow the selections by deciding which would move forward.

Ms. Aitken wanted to rank the viable maps to present to the Town Council. Chair Stevens was willing to hear the Board's opinions on the maps and provide several ranked maps but did not want to provide 12 suggestions. Mr. Curtis did not want to provide only one map. Mr. McLaughlin wanted a target number of how many maps to provide to Council. Mr. Jennings asked if the Committee had a mandate to submit one or several. Assistant Town Clerk McDaniel advised that previous Committee's had always submitted three with a fourth one of no change. Chair Stevens suggested that three would be appropriate. He advised that the job of this Committee was to review all the suggestions and recommend what was most appropriate. Mr. Calloway did not want to be locked into having to submit only three options.

Chair Stevens confirmed that the Committee's purpose was an advisory capacity only. Mr. Calloway wanted the Board to keep an open mind as GeoWeb may not agree with their recommendations. Ms. Aitken wanted to revisit the ones rejected at the previous meeting and rank them. Chair Stevens disagreed.

Chair Stevens opened the meeting for public comment.

Jim Inklebarger, Oak Knoll II resident and president of the homeowner's association, advised that he had served on the Pine Island Ridge Annexation Transition Team and wanted to discuss their concerns. It was disconcerting for their association to look at the three options on the website, which placed Pine Island in District 1. He stated that the association wanted the opportunity to participate in the upcoming elections and that District 1 was far removed from the interests and concerns of the Pine Island community. Mr. Inklebarger would bring that up to Council but wanted the Committee to keep them in consideration.

Karen Stenzel-Nowicki, 5840 SW 55 Avenue, asked if the Committee had been provided with the local, County and State statutes regarding previous re-districting policies. She also questioned if gerrymandering fit into the law both locally and on a State level along with the Town's Charter so that an informed decision would be made. Mr. Burton stated that Public Law 94-171 was provided which was the Census 2000 Re-districting Data Summary File. He directed Ms. Stenzel-Nowicki to the broward.org website and Town website for other data that was provided. Ms. Stenzel-Nowicki wanted to know if the panel's decision would be solely based on population or would politics and party affiliation be considered. Mr. Burton stated the criteria was based upon the Town's Charter.

There were no other comments provided from the audience.

DAVIE DISTRICT BOUNDARIES
REVIEW COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 6, 2006

Ms. Volarich stated that Scenario 1 was mapped out by numbers and all were within 4-5%. She added that Imagination Farms was split between District 3 and 4. Ms. Aitken commented that previously, approved Option 2 did the same thing. Mr. McLaughlin added that at the time it was approved, the Boardmembers did not have the Communities of Interest mapped out.

Ms. Volarich stated that Scenario 2 numbers were good and Communities of Interest were okay. Scenario 3 had a different layout and the numbers and Communities of Interest were good. Vice-Chair Burgess asked if the voting precincts were a concern, to which Ms. Volarich informed him that the precincts would be split.

Ms. Volarich continued with Scenario's 4 and 5 which numbers were okay. She moved on to Scenario 6 and pointed out that this was a modified Option 2 submitted by Mr. Spages. Mr. Spages stated that the modifications were based on comments made at the last meeting.

Ms. Volarich stated that Scenario 7 had a few modifications. Scenario 8 and 9 were new plans in which GeoWeb kept the Communities of Interest intact and the numbers within range. Mr. Calloway asked what the objective and considerations were in creating Scenario 8. Ms. Volarich stated that GeoWeb had solely looked at the population and keeping the Communities of Interest intact.

Chair Stevens asked Ms. Volarich to point out the implications both positive and negative that GeoWeb saw with each Scenario plus the ones approved from the last meeting.

Scenario 1 – Ms. Volarich stated that Imagination Farms was split and an important community to keep together based on the Committee's comments. Mr. Burton added that it met the population criteria and district boundaries were compact. Mr. Calloway asked if anyone had a feel for future population trends. Mr. Burton advised that the data provided had projections for Broward County through 2030. Chair Stevens stated that he would not vote for any map that removed Councilmembers from their district. GeoWeb did not find any ordinance that required redistricting to take into account Councilmember and the district they resided in.

Scenario 2 – Mr. Burton stated that the boundaries were contiguous. The Communities of Interest were intact and Imagination Farms remained in its current district. He felt it was a presentable option.

Scenario 3 – Ms. Volarich felt an issue with this proposal was the way Districts 2 and 3 were split horizontally versus vertically, although they were contiguous and compact. Ms. Aitken added that it was not relevant if Scenario 1 was acceptable and it was going all the way to Pine Island Ridge.

Scenario 4 – Mr. Burton stated that this was a different configuration and was a radical change. It met the criteria but did not look like a viable option that Council would consider.

Scenario 5 – Mr. Burton stated that this scenario was similar to Scenario 4. Mr. Calloway questioned why it was different from Scenario's 2 and 3. Mr. Burton replied that it reached out across existing districts. Ms. Aitken added that it was similar to previously approved Option 3. Mr. Burton discussed gerrymandering and he did not see a deliberate attempt at gerrymandering with this proposal but felt it could be a problem. He added that the district boundaries were non-partisan, he did not agree with this option. Mr. Calloway stated that all options needed to meet all criteria, protect minority population, and avoid gerrymandering.

Scenario 6 – Mr. Burton felt that this option was not as compact and contiguous.

Scenario 7 – Ms. Volarich stated that this option was a slight alteration with moving TAZ 565 as the only change. Mr. Burton stated that TAZ 565 had a large population and should be kept in its existing district. Ms. Aitken pointed out that Pine Island Ridge was also a large community. She read the gerrymandering law and referred to "packing and cracking" which was trying to compact one district with all the support for an incumbent seat and where a district was split so no one had a safe seat.

Scenario 8 – Ms. Volarich confirmed there was a balance of population numbers and the Communities of Interest were kept together.

DAVIE DISTRICT BOUNDARIES
REVIEW COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 6, 2006

Scenario 9 – Mr. Burton said that this was similar to the previous options in that it kept Imagination Farms in its existing district; however, District 3 was on the threshold at 10.9%.

Chair Stevens asked if GeoWeb had taken any steps in determining where minority residents reside and whether any of these maps had divided up those communities. Mr. Burton stated that the Committee was provided this information in a packet at the first meeting which he would address later in the meeting. Mr. Calloway asked that they address the issue of party affiliation as well. Ms. Volarich advised that GeoWeb did not have that information. Ms. Aitken said the Committee was not allowed to address party affiliations. Chair Stevens stated that the Committee was not allowed to intentionally divide precincts to make it easier for any particular affiliation. Ms. Aitken stated that she was quoting case law and she brought this up specifically because of the comments that Forest Ridge had to remain in the current district and it should not have to.

Mr. Spages stated that this Committee had never considered party affiliation and was trying to maintain the current representatives in their districts. He added that it was only six years ago that Davie did not have single member districts and campaigns could be done townwide. Ms. Aitken disagreed and cited *Foreman vs. Butterworth*, a 2002 Florida case that stated that re-districting could not intentionally be based on partisan politics party lines. Chair Stevens stated that if this was going to get into a legal discussion, the Town's legal counsel should be present, or this issue should be addressed at the next Town Council meeting when the attorney was present. He felt it was inappropriate for himself or anyone on the panel to present any legal representations regarding what the law says. Ms. Aitken felt the Committee should ignore the voting precincts and party affiliations. Chair Stevens said the maps did not represent party affiliations and the only question was whether any map was intentionally trying to split up party affiliations.

Chair Stevens asked GeoWeb to explain if there was potential for a minority based district. Mr. Burton answered that the current population was 87.5% White and 4.7% African American. District 2 had the highest minority population with 1,747. Chair Stevens questioned if any of the maps showed splitting that minority group. Mr. Burton pointed out the minority population was centered by the universities and pointed to various areas on the current District 2 map.

Chair Stevens asked GeoWeb to review the Options approved at the last meeting.

Option 1: Mr. Burton said that this map had a problem with compactness. The population numbers were okay.

Option 2: Mr. Burton felt the minority areas were a concern and the numbers were close. Mr. Spages felt it was a moot point and was superseded by Scenario 6.

Option 3: Mr. Burton did not feel that this was a viable option.

Chair Stevens asked if there was any further discussion. He clarified that all the maps were reviewed and felt a vote could be taken as to what recommendations could be sent to Council. Ms. Aitken suggested that following the discussion, the Committee should rank the maps. Chair Stevens felt that this was a public hearing and the public had the right to hear the comments.

Before the vote, a recess was taken at 7:34 p.m. to allow GeoWeb time to process the data. The meeting resumed at 7:41 p.m.

During the break, Chair Stevens advised that he had been informed that this had to be the final meeting. He stated that a rating system was not necessary and that a vote should be taken on all maps presented.

DAVIE DISTRICT BOUNDARIES
REVIEW COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 6, 2006

Mr. Calloway motioned to have Scenario 8 and 9 move forward. Mr. Spages felt a voice vote should be taken on each map. Motion died due to the lack of a second.

Committee Maps:

Scenario 9: Mr. Calloway made a motion to move forward. Motion died due to a lack of a second.

Vice-Chair Burgess questioned if too many maps were approved, would there be an opportunity to make a further cut later. Chair Stevens explained that if a motion passed, then one would have to be in the prevailing side of the motion in order to move to reconsider it. Assistant Town Clerk McDaniel added that if the motion was to move it forward and the motion was denied, whoever voted to deny could also move to reconsider.

Scenario 6: Mr. Jennings made a motion, seconded by Mr. Calloway, to move forward. In a voice vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Stevens - yes; Vice-Chair Burgess - yes; Ms. Aitkin - no; Mr. Calloway - yes; Mr. Curtis - no; Mr. Jennings - yes; Mr. McLaughlin - no; Mr. Spages - yes; Mr. Thomas -yes. (Motion carried 6-3)

Scenario 8: Mr. Calloway made a motion, seconded by Mr. Spages, to move forward. In a voice vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Stevens - yes; Vice-Chair Burgess - yes; Ms. Aitkin - no; Mr. Calloway - yes; Mr. Curtis - no; Mr. Jennings - yes; Mr. McLaughlin - yes; Mr. Spages - no; Mr. Thomas -yes. (Motion carried 6-3)

Scenario 2: Mr. Curtis made a motion, seconded by Mr. McLaughlin, to move forward. In a voice vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Stevens - no; Vice-Chair Burgess - no; Ms. Aitkin - yes; Mr. Calloway - no; Mr. Curtis - yes; Mr. Jennings - no; Mr. McLaughlin - yes; Mr. Spages - no; Mr. Thomas - no. (Motion denied 6-3)

Scenario 7: Mr. Curtis made a motion, seconded by Mr. McLaughlin, to move forward. In a voice vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Stevens - no; Vice-Chair Burgess - yes; Ms. Aitkin - yes; Mr. Calloway - no; Mr. Curtis - yes; Mr. Jennings - yes; Mr. McLaughlin - yes; Mr. Spages - no; Mr. Thomas - yes. (Motion carried 6-3)

Mr. Spages made a motion, seconded by Mr. Calloway, to adjourn since three maps had been approved. Ms. Aitken objected and wanted to review all the options. Mr. McLaughlin was in agreement and felt all options should be given due process. Mr. Spages stated that he had looked at all the proposals for a month and felt a motion to adjourn was in order. Ms. Aitken pointed out that the new maps had only been posted for several days. Mr. Calloway asked that if someone on the Board had something to add, it should be brought up, otherwise his mind was made up. In a voice vote to adjourn, the vote was as follows: Chair Stevens - no; Vice-Chair Burgess - yes; Ms. Aitkin - no; Mr. Calloway - no; Mr. Curtis - no; Mr. Jennings - no; Mr. McLaughlin - no; Mr. Spages - yes; Mr. Thomas -yes. (Motion denied 6-3)

Scenario 1: Chair Stevens made a motion, seconded by Mr. Calloway, to deny. In a voice vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Stevens - yes; Vice-Chair Burgess - yes; Ms. Aitkin - no; Mr. Calloway - yes; Mr. Curtis - no; Mr. Jennings - yes; Mr. McLaughlin - yes; Mr. Spages - yes; Mr. Thomas -yes. (Motion carried 7-2)

DAVIE DISTRICT BOUNDARIES
REVIEW COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 6, 2006

Scenario 3: Chair Stevens made a motion, seconded by Mr. Calloway, to deny. In a voice vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Stevens - yes; Vice-Chair Burgess - yes; Ms. Aitkin - no; Mr. Calloway - yes; Mr. Curtis - no; Mr. Jennings - yes; Mr. McLaughlin - yes; Mr. Spages - yes; Mr. Thomas -yes. (Motion carried 7-2)

Scenario 4: Ms. Aitken withdrew this option.

Scenario 5: Ms. Aitken withdrew this option.

Option 1: Mr. McLaughlin made a motion, seconded by Mr. Jennings, to move it forward. In a voice vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Stevens - yes; Vice-Chair Burgess - yes; Ms. Aitkin - no; Mr. Calloway - yes; Mr. Curtis - yes; Mr. Jennings - yes; Mr. McLaughlin - yes; Mr. Spages - yes; Mr. Thomas -yes. (Motion carried 8-1)

Chair Stevens renamed Option 1 to Scenario 10 to avoid confusion and would replace Scenario 7.

Scenario 7 reconsidered: Mr. McLaughlin made a motion, seconded by Mr. Spages, to reconsider. In a voice vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Stevens - yes; Vice-Chair Burgess - yes; Ms. Aitkin - yes; Mr. Calloway - yes; Mr. Curtis - no; Mr. Jennings - yes; Mr. McLaughlin - yes; Mr. Spages - yes; Mr. Thomas - yes. (Motion carried 8-1)

Scenario 7: Mr. Spages made a motion, seconded by Mr. McLaughlin, to remove. In a voice vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Stevens - yes; Vice-Chair Burgess - yes; Ms. Aitkin - yes; Mr. Calloway - yes; Mr. Curtis - no; Mr. Jennings - yes; Mr. McLaughlin - yes; Mr. Spages - yes; Mr. Thomas -yes. (Motion carried 8-1)

Chair Stevens summarized the approved maps as follows: Scenario's 6, 8, and 10.

Mr. Spages made a motion, seconded by Mr. Calloway, to adjourn. Mr. McLaughlin and Ms. Aitken objected as there were other options to consider. Mr. Spages withdrew his motion.

Option 2: Mr. Spages withdrew this option.

Option 3: Chair Stevens made a motion, seconded by Mr. Calloway, to deny. In a voice vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Stevens - yes; Vice-Chair Burgess - yes; Ms. Aitkin - no; Mr. Calloway - yes; Mr. Curtis - no; Mr. Jennings - yes; Mr. McLaughlin - yes; Mr. Spages - yes; Mr. Thomas -yes. (Motion carried 7-2)

Scenario 9: GeoWeb withdrew this option and replaced it with 9A.

Scenario 9A: Mr. Spages made a motion, seconded by Chair Stevens, to deny. In a voice vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Stevens - yes; Vice-Chair Burgess - no; Ms. Aitkin - no; Mr. Calloway - yes; Mr. Curtis - no; Mr. Jennings - yes; Mr. McLaughlin - no; Mr. Spages - yes; Mr. Thomas -yes. (Motion carried 5-4)

Chair Stevens requested that when GeoWeb presented the maps to Council, they notify Council which were approved or denied by the Committee.

DAVIE DISTRICT BOUNDARIES
REVIEW COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 6, 2006

Mr. Calloway asked which maps GeoWeb supported to which Mr. Burton replied maps 7, 8 and 9. Mr. Spages wanted clarification on which maps the Committee passed and would be presented to Council. Assistant Town Clerk McDaniel stated the Board were presenting 6, 8, and 10 and GeoWeb would present 7 and the new 9.

Ms. Aitken objected to the manner in which the voting was taken.

4. COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Assistant Town Clerk McDaniel advised that tapes of the meeting had to be retained for two years after the Boardmembers adopted the minutes. Since this was the Committee’s last meeting, a set of minutes would be produced and the Committee members would need to sign the minutes indicating their approval.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business and no objections, Mr. Calloway motioned to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Spages. In a voice vote, all voted in favor. (Motion carried 9-0). The meeting was adjourned at 8:33 p.m.

Date Approved: _____	_____
	Chair
Date Approved: _____	_____
	Vice-Chair
Date Approved: _____	_____
	Board Member
Date Approved: _____	_____
	Board Member
Date Approved: _____	_____
	Board Member
Date Approved: _____	_____
	Board Member
Date Approved: _____	_____
	Board Member
Date Approved: _____	_____
	Board Member
Date Approved: _____	_____
	Board Member